

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/017,852 12/12/2001		12/12/2001	David J. Norris	42P11635	9597		
8791	7590	02/06/2006	EXAMINER				
BLAKEI	Y SOK	OLOFF TAYLOR &	HOANG,	HOANG, THAI D			
12400 WI SEVENTI		BOULEVARD R	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
<b></b>		CA 90025-1030	2668				
					DATE MAILED: 02/06/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)					
				NORRIS ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	10/017,89 Examine		Art Unit					
		Thai D. H	nano	2668					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication a				ldress				
Period fo				•					
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REACHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state ply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF TH 1.136(a). In no evi lod will apply and w tute, cause the app	HIS COMMUNICATION ent, however, may a reply be tim ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from lication to become ABANDONEI	. ely filed the mailing date of this c O (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Rt This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) To Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the practice und	his action is n	on-final. for formal matters, pro		e merits is				
Dispositi	on of Claims								
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	4)  Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5)  Claim(s) 6-13 and 17-19 is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 1-5 and 14-16 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicati	on Papers								
10)	The specification is objected to by the Exam The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corrupt to oath or declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) he drawing(s) tection is require	ne held in abeyance. See ed if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 Cl					
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>									
2) D Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 r No(s)/Mail Date	08)	4) Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te	O-152)				

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Srinivasan, US Patent Application Publication 2001/0023430 A1, in view of Anderson et al, US Patent No. 5,436,896, hereafter referred to as Srinivasan and Anderson respectively.

Regarding claims 1-2 and 14, Srinivasan discloses a method and system provides for the simultaneous processing of audio and document information during a conference call. The system creates a conference bridge that allows a plurality of participants access to the conferencing over a data network using IP telephony (receiving a request to create an audio bridge session over a packet network between a plurality of call terminals). Srinivasan discloses that an access code is distributed to all participants. At the time that an audio conference is to be held, the participants call into the audio conference bridge. The attendees can establish audio communications through their user interface using IP telephony. The conferencing bridge also includes a connection to the data network and is able to receive and process the IP telephony communications, paragraphs [0005]-[0006] and [0022]. Srinivasan does not explicitly disclose the access number is a bridge number, and the bridge number is a telephone

Art Unit: 2668

number. However, Anderson discloses the participants dial a specific telephone number of conference bridge to setup a conference, col. 3, line 67-col. 4, line 2 (determining whether an access number associated with said one of said plurality of call terminals is a bridge number; and creating said audio bridge session using said access number; wherein said access number is a telephone number). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply bridge number disclosed by Anderson into Srinivasan's system in order to simplify procedure for accessing to a conference.

Regarding claims 3 and 15, in figure 3, Srinivasan discloses the system comprises the steps of: receiving phone calls from conference participants for access to the conference (receiving a plurality of call requests with said access number). The processor of the system will perform an analysis of the access code (bridge number or PIN), and if the number is invalid access to the meeting will be denied. If the number is valid, access is granted and a further query is made of each attendee (determining whether said access number is a bridge number using a bridge table; establishing a call connection for each call request if said access number is said bridge number). Finally, the system combines all requested access to begin conference (combining each call connection to form said audio bridge session). Fig.3, paragraphs [0022] and [0026].

Regarding claims 4 and 16, since the system disclosed by Srinivasan is a conference system between a leader and participants, therefore, it inherently comprises the steps as recited in claim 4 for transmitting, mixing and receiving IP packet (receiving

a stream of packets representing audio information over each call connection; directing each stream of packets to an intermediate device; and mixing said streams of packets.)

Regarding claim 5, Srinivasan does not explicitly disclose the system operates in accordance with a Transport Control Protocol, Internet Protocol, and H.323 specification. However, TCP/IP and H.323 are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply TCP/IP and H.323 in to Srinivasan's system in order to adapt with conventional system used in the Network.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-13 and 17-19 are allowed for reasons given in the previous office actions.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 and 14-16 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

The following references are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to the application:

US Patent No. 6,839,416 B1, Shaffer, "Apparatus and method for controlling an audio conference."

US Patent No. 6,850,609 B1, Schrage, "Methods and apparatus for providing speech recording and speech transcription services."

Application/Control Number: 10/017,852 Page 5

Art Unit: 2668

US Patent No. 6,272,214 B1, Jonsson, "Automatic control of participation in telemeetings."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thai D. Hoang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3184. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on (571) 272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thai Hoang

PERMISORY PATENT EXAMINATED TO THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF